



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,085	08/05/2003	Duke W. Goss	Goss "F"	7228
7590 06/01/2005				
Delbert J. Barnard Barnard, Loop & McCormack LLP P.O. Box 58888 Seattle, WA 98138			EXAMINER EVANISKO, LESLIE J	
			ART UNIT 2854	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/635,085	Applicant(s) GOSS, DUKE W. (mg)	
	Examiner Leslie J. Evanisko	Art Unit 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/23/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the species shown in Figures 1-19 and the subspecies of the exposure unit shown by Figures 1-27, claims 1-32, in the reply filed on March 14, 2005 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 33-38 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species/subspecies, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on March 14, 2005.

Priority

3. It is noted that the present application is a CIP of U.S. Application No. 10/635,085 as set forth in the specific reference in the first sentence of the specification to the earlier filed application made in the instant application. However, it is suggested that the status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should be updated. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. ____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "80" has been used to designate both "the mounting brackets" (pg 9, ln 25) and "the positive image carrier" (pg 11, ln 31).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities: In Figure 10, it appears that the right-hand occurrence of reference numeral 18 should be reference numeral 20 since it appears to be designating the swing arm 20 as described in the specification. In Figure 17, there is no lead line associated with reference numeral 68 on the left-hand side, making it unclear as to what structure it is intended to be designating. In Figure 28, reference numeral "R" has not been described in the specification. To correct this problem, it is suggested that the term "L" on page 17, line 20 be deleted and replaced with --R--.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the

remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: It appears that the term "lamps 40" on pages 7-8 should be --lamps 42-- to be consistent with how the lamps were previously defined (pg 7, ln 29) and are shown in the drawings. On page 8, line 14, reference numeral 24 has been used to describe both the screen frame and the clamp structure. It appears the clamp structure should actually be defined with reference numeral 22 (see pg 8, ln 23). On page 12, line 15, it appears that the term "positives" should be --stripes-- to use consistent terminology as that used earlier in the line.

Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

8. The use of the trademark MYLAR has been noted in this application (for example, page 12, line 8). It should be in all capital letters wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

9. Claims 2-3, 5, 8-10, 13-15, and 17-32 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With respect to claims 2 and 18, it appears the term "a second positive imagine" in each claim should be deleted and replaced with --a second positive image-- to correct an obvious typographical error.

With respect to claim 14, the term "the common support" in line 2 has no proper antecedent basis since the common support is only previously recited in claims 7 or 8 and claim 14 depends upon claim 5. Note a similar problem occurs in claim 15. Additionally, in each of claims 13, 14, and 15, it is suggested that the term "it" in the last line of each claim be deleted and replaced with the structure to which "it" is referring to insure the claim language is clear.

With respect to claim 17, line 3, it is suggested that the term --are-- be inserted after "that" and the term --a-- be inserted after --in-- to provide language that appears to be inadvertently omitted.

With respect to claims 30 and 31, the term "the common support" in line 2 of each claim has no proper antecedent basis because the common support

Art Unit: 2854

was only previously recited in claims 23 or 24. Additionally, in each of claims 29, 30, and 31, it is suggested that the term "it" in the last line of each claim be deleted and replaced with the structure to which "it" is referring to insure the claim language is clear.

With respect to claim 32, the recitation of an elongated, horizontal support arm in line 2 is somewhat confusing since an elongated, horizontal support arm was previously recited in claim 17 and it is not clear whether the support arm recited in claim 32 is a different arm than the one recited in claim 17 or the same.

Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oleson (US 5,921,176). Oleson teaches a screen printing machine comprising an exposure unit 15 having a light transmitting top 17, a light below the top (in housing 16), and a frame member 30 bordering the top, the frame member including a plurality of spaced apart locator pins 35 that extend upwardly from

Art Unit: 2854

the frame member, a light transmitting positive image carrier 2 positionable on the light transmitting top, the positive image carrier including a plurality of locator pin openings 3 in which the locator pins are received, the locator pins and locator pin openings serving to position the positive image carrier in a predetermined position on the top of the exposure unit, and a positive image positioned at a predetermined location on the positive image carrier. See Figure 3 and Figure 5 and columns 4-5 in particular.

With respect to claims 2-3, note Oleson teaches multiple carrier sheets 2 each having perimeter holes 3 can be prepared for each color to be used in forming the composite multicolor image, as described in column 4, lines 55-60. Note, therefore, that each carrier sheet 2 therefore has its own positive image positioned at a predetermined location on the carrier sheet relative to the positive image on the other carrier sheets. Furthermore, note each carrier sheet is capable of being placed on the locator pins on the frame member to position each carrier sheet on top of other carrier sheets and on top of the exposure unit as broadly recited.

With respect to claims 4-6, note Oleson teaches multiple screens in column 4, lines 58-60, wherein each screen can be selectively positionable over the exposure frame, one at a time, for exposure and preparation of the screen for printing. Again, attention is invited to column 4, lines 46-60.

With respect to claims 7-8, note Oleson teaches a common support (i.e. frame 30, surface 17, housing 16) for the exposure unit and the printing

Art Unit: 2854

screens, so that the printing screens occupy a predetermined position relative to the exposure unit, as broadly recited.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 11-12 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Claims 9-10 and 13-15 are objected for the reasons set forth above as well as for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the above objections to the satisfaction of the Examiner and in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Claims 17-32 are objected to for the reasons set forth above, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the above objections to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

15. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to claims 9 and 11 in particular, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a screen printing machine having all of the structure

as recited, in combination with and particularly including, having a frame and printing screen support mounted on the frame for rotation about a vertical axis such that each printing screen is positioned on the support so as to be selectively and individually positionable above the exposure unit by rotation of the support.

With respect to claims 13-15, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a screen printing machine having all of the structure as recited, in combination with and particularly including, having a connector between the common support between the exposure unit and printing screen including a detachable pin and socket connection adapted to allow the printing screen to be detached from the support and then reattached to the support at the same position that it previously occupied.

With respect to claim 17, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a screen printing machine having all of the structure as recited, in combination with and particularly including, having a main frame including an elongated, horizontal support arm and an exposure unit and a work piece table that are interchangeably mounted in a predetermined position on the support arm.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Adams (US 6,101,938), Newman (US 5,648,189), and


Proffer (US 5,127,321) each teach a screen printing registration system and exposure unit having obvious similarities to the claimed subject matter.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Leslie J. Evanisko** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2161**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lje
May 31, 2005


Leslie J. Evanisko
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854